MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
LOS ANGELES

1 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on January 23, 2012, at 11:15 a.m. or as soon thereafter 2 as this matter may be heard in Courtroom 9 of the United States District Court for the Southern 3 District of California, located at 940 Front Street, San Diego, California 92101, the Honorable Larry A. Burns presiding, Defendant Chase Bank USA, N.A. ("Chase"), wrongfully named JP 4 5 Morgan Chase Bank, will move, pursuant to Rules 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of 6 Civil Procedure, for an Order dismissing the Class Action Complaint filed by Plaintiff Lucille 7 Royse ("Plaintiff") on the grounds that the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over the 8 Complaint, and that it fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. 9 First, the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claim because she has 10 failed to establish diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. As the party invoking this 11 Court's jurisdiction, Plaintiff bears the burden of establishing the Court's subject matter 12 jurisdiction. Kanter v. Warner-Lambert Co., 265 F.3d 853, 857-58 (9th Cir. 2001); Thompson v. 13 McCombe, 99 F.3d 352, 353 (9th Cir. 1996). In her Complaint, Plaintiff fails to allege that the 14 amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000 or \$5,000.000, as required to invoke this Court's 15 diversity jurisdiction; nor could she, as a review of her allegations demonstrate that the claims do 16 not come close to meeting these thresholds. Additionally, Plaintiff fails to even plead her own 17 citizenship. As a result, the Court should dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice for lack of 18 subject matter jurisdiction, pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1). 19 Second, the Court should dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint because she has made no showing 20 that Chase violated California's Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("Rosenthal Act"), 21 Cal. Civ. § 1788 et seq. Plaintiff's claim fails because the purportedly false statements in a letter 22 sent on behalf of Chase to Plaintiff are true and accurate and, even under the least sophisticated 23 debtor standard, Plaintiff's reading of the statements is idiosyncratic. See Gonzales v. Arrow 24 Financial Services, LLC, No. 10–55379, 2011 WL 4430844 (C.A. 9 (Cal.) Sept. 23, 2011). 25 Accordingly, Plaintiff's Complaint should be dismissed with prejudice, pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6). 26 /// 27 /// ///

DB2/22747050.1

| 1 | This Motion will be based on this Notice; the Memorandum of Points and Authorities in |
|-------------|--|
| 2 | Support of the Motion; Request for Judicial Notice; Chase's Reply papers; the Court's file in this |
| 3 | case; all other matters which may be judicially noticed; and other argument and evidence that |
| 4 | may be presented at the hearing. |
| 5 | |
| 6 | Dated: October 28, 2011 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP |
| 7 | |
| 8 | By /s/ Christina L. Sein |
| 9 | Christina L. Sein Attorneys for Defendant |
| 10 | Attorneys for Defendant CHASE BANK USA, N.A. E-mail: csein@morganlewis.com |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 wis & | CASE NO 3:11-CV-02255-I AB-CAR |

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
LOS ANGELES

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on **October 28, 2011**, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the U.S. District Court for the Southern District by using the CM/ECF system. I certify that all participants are registered CM/ECF users and that service was accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

/s/ Christina L. Sein
Christina L. Sein
Attorneys for Defendant

Attorneys for Defendant CHASE BANK USA, N.A.

27

28

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

LOS ANGELES